United Nations E/2001/8

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
22 February 2001
English
Original: Arabic/Chinese/English/
French/Spanish

Resumed organizational session of 2001
3 and 4 May 2001
Agenda item 2
Adoption of the agenda and other organizational matters

Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its resumed 2000 session (New York, 15-26 January 2001)

Summary

At its 2000 resumed session, held from 15 to 26 January 2001, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had before it 147 applications for consultative status, including applications deferred from its 1998 and 1999 session and the first and second part of its 2000 session. Of those applications, the Committee recommended 52 applications for consultative status, did not recommend six organizations, deferred 87 organizations for further consideration at a later date and closed consideration of two applications. The Committee considered seven requests for reclassification of consultative status; it recommended two organizations for reclassification, deferred consideration of the reclassification of four organizations and recommended that one organization remain in the same category.

The Committee heard 17 representatives of non-governmental organizations, an unprecedented number, who were given the opportunity to respond to questions raised by the Committee. The additional information provided by the representatives facilitated the debate and the work of the Committee in taking its decisions.

The present report contains two draft decisions on matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council. By draft decision I, the Council would:

(a) Grant consultative status to 52 non-governmental organizations which have applied;

(b) Reclassify two organizations from special to general consultative status;

(c) Not grant consultative status to six non-governmental organizations;

(d) Note that the Committee has decided to close consideration of the application of two non-governmental organizations;

(e) Take note that three cases of complaints submitted by States have been closed.

By draft decision II, the Council would take note of the present report.

01-26232 (E) 270301 300301

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council	1	3
II.	Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations	2–68	4
	A. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from the 1999 session of the Committee	4–43	4
	1. Applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (1998 and 1999)	5–38	4
	2. Requests for reclassification for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (1998 and 1999)	39–43	10
	B. New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification	44–68	11
	1. New applications for consultative status	45–62	11
	2. New requests for reclassification	63–68	16
III.	Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special status with the Economic and Social Council	69	16
IV.	Implementation of Economic and Social Council decision 1996/302	70–75	16
V.	Consideration of special reports	76–98	17
	A. Special reports	77–81	17
	B. Complaints submitted by States	82–98	18
VI.	Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304	99–124	26
	A. Working group established to review some aspects of the work of the Committee	100–114	26
	B. Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31	115–124	28
VII.	Organization of the work of the session	125–132	29
	A. Opening and duration of the session	125	29
	B. Attendance	126–130	29
	C. Agenda	131	29
	D. Documentation	132	30
VIII.	Adoption of the report of the Committee on its resumed 2000 session	133	30
Annex			
	List of documents before the Committee at its resumed 2000 session		31

I. Matters calling for action by the Economic and Social Council

1. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations recommends to the Economic and Social Council the adoption of the following draft decisions:

Draft decision I
Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations

The Economic and Social Council decides:

(a) To grant the following non-governmental organizations consultative status:

Special consultative status

Association jeunesse culture loisirs technique

Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North Siberia and Far East of the Russian Federation

Association santé et environnement

Association tunisienne du planning familial

Centre for Development Studies and Action

Center for Adivase Studies and Peace

Center for Migration Studies of New York

Center for Studies on Turkey

Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries

Comité algérien des droits de l'homme et des peuples

Côte d'Ivoire Ecologie

DIYA

Empowering Widows in Development

Fédération européenne d'associations nationales travaillant avec les sans-abri

Foundation for the Social Promotion of Culture

Girls Incorporated

Grameena Vikas Samithi

Greek Council for Refugees

Hadassah

Indian Council for Child Welfare

Institute for Security Studies

International Family Health

International Telecommunication Academy

International Women's Rights Action Watch

Kethea

Korea Women's Associations United

League of Kenya Women Voters

Lebanese Association for Popular Action

Marie Stopes International

Mediterranean Council for Burns and Fire Disasters

Mediterranean Women's Forum

Mexican Foundation for Family Planning

MINBYUN

Mira Resource Center for Black, Immigrant and Refugee Women

Monitor International

National Association of Women Organizations in Uganda

National Board of Catholic Women of England and Wales

National Fishworkers' Forum

Netherlands Association of Women's Interests, Women's Work and Equal Citizenship

Society to Support Children Suffering From Cancer

Triglav Circle

Women's Health in Women's Hands

United Nations Association of Mauritius

Zhinocha Hromada

Roster

Centro de Derechos Humanos Miguel Augustin Pro Juarez

European Fertilizer Manufacturers Association

Fayette Companies

Global Crop Protection Federation

SOS Women

Support Coalition International

Yachay Wasi

YMCA of/du Canada

(b) To reclassify two organizations from special to general consultative status as follows:

General consultative status

Agence internationale pour le développement

Association tunisienne des mères

(c) Not to grant consultative status to the following six non-governmental organizations:

Christian Solidarity Worldwide

International Group of P&I Clubs

Management Science for Health

Mandat international

National Opinion Research Centre

Olabisi Olaleye Foundation

(d) To note that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations decided to close consideration of the applications of the following non-governmental organizations:

Hague Appeal for Peace

Youth Federation of World Peace

(e) To take note that three cases of complaints submitted by States have been closed.

Draft decision II
Report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its resumed 2000 session

The Economic and Social Council takes note of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations on its resumed 2000 session.

II. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification received from non-governmental organizations

2. The Committee considered item 3 of its agenda at its 768th to 780th, 783rd, 785th and 786th meetings, on 15 to 26 January 2001.

3. It had before it the following documents:

(a) Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status (E/C.2/2000/R.2 and Add. 10-16);

(b) Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing requests for reclassification (E/C.2/2000/R.3 and Add.1 and 2);

(c) Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications deferred from previous sessions of the Committee held in 1998-1999 (E/C.2/2000/CRP.1/Rev.1);

(d) Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing deferred requests for reclassification (E/C.2/2000/CRP.3);

(e) Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications deferred from the first and second parts of the 2000 session of the Committee (E/C.2/2000/CRP.5).

A. Applications for consultative status and requests for reclassification deferred from the 1999 session of the Committee

4. The Committee considered applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions at its 768th to 770th, 775th and 776th meetings, on 15, 16, 18 and 19 January.

1. Applications for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (1998 and 1999)

Local Government International Bureau

5. The application of the Local Government International Bureau had been deferred to the 1999 resumed session, at which time the Committee had discussed its earlier concerns about the close ties the

organization maintained with local governments and whether they would affect its eligibility to be considered as a non-governmental organization under the criteria contained in Council resolution 1996/31. Concern had also been expressed over the fact that the majority of the organization's funding came from Governments. Consideration of the application had been deferred to the 2000 session, at which the same issues had been discussed. At its resumed 2000 session, the Committee expressed the same concerns. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, the Committee decided to defer further consideration of the application, pending receipt of clarification on issues raised by the Committee.

International Prostitutes Collective

6. The Committee had deferred consideration of the application of the International Prostitutes Collective at its 1999 and 2000 sessions, pending further clarification from the organization. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, the Committee had before it a request by the organization to defer consideration of its application to the next session. The Committee, noting that it was not the privilege of an organization to decide whether it could be deferred, decided to defer consideration of International Prostitutes Collective, pending a response from the organization to the questions posed by the Committee at its previous session, to which the organization had not responded.

Christian Solidarity Worldwide

7. The Committee reviewed the application of Christian Solidarity Worldwide at its 2000 session. A number of questions were posed which were answered by the organization. Having reviewed the replies, one delegation pointed out that the organization was the same as Christian Solidarity International, with the same legal registration number in the United Kingdom. It had illegally entered the Sudan on several occasions and carried out illegal activities in that country, without obtaining clearance from the concerned governmental authorities, and had direct ties with the rebel Sudan People's Liberation Army in the southern Sudan. At its 769th meeting on 15 January 2001, the same delegation stressed that the organization in its responses to questions posed by the Committee had acknowledged its activities in the southern part of the Sudan, pointing out that it would continue them in the future. The delegation added that the organization was supporting armed groups trying to topple the constitutional Government in her country, and requested that the Committee take a consensus decision not to recommend the organization for consultative status with the Council. Another delegation expressed the view that the organization was involved in relief work in several parts of the world. According to the delegation, there was no information that the organization had engaged in the violent acts that had afflicted southern Sudan for many years. The organization was trying to operate in a conflict zone. A recorded roll-call vote was requested by the delegation of the United States. The Committee, by a roll-call vote of one in favour to 11 against, with six abstentions, recommended that the Council not grant consultative status to the organization. The voting was as follows:*

In favour:

United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Lebanon, Pakistan, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey.

Abstaining:

Bolivia, Chile, France, Germany, India, Romania.

* Speaking after the vote, the representative of Colombia informed the Committee that, had she been present during the vote, she would have voted against.

Human Rights International Alliance

8. At its 1999 session, the Committee had considered the application of the Human Rights International Alliance (HRIA) and decided to defer it to its resumed 1999 session, pending receipt of further information from the organization. At its 1999 resumed session, the Committee had again deferred the request pending further clarification from the organization. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred consideration of the application, pending clarification on similarities existing between the organization and the Global Peace Foundation. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, the Committee reviewed the application. One delegate pointed out that in the list of member organizations of HRIA, at least one organization, Jeay Sind Mahaz, was politically affiliated to the Tamil Centre for Human Rights, while one other was associated with terrorist activities. For that reason, the Committee at its 2000 session had declined the request

of the Tamil Centre for Human Rights for consultative status. Other delegations expressed reservations concerning the organization, and one delegation asked why the organization was seeking status since most of its members had consultative status.

9. The representative of the organization, in addressing the questions posed by the Committee, stressed that his organization did not support terrorism and that it strongly opposed violence. He also added that the affiliated members of his organizations had their own objectives and did not abide by the programmes of HRIA. The Committee decided to defer the application for further consideration.

Kashmiri American Council

10. One Committee member expressed his belief that the organization was a political one. Having examined the response of the organization, he noted that although the organization had provided responses to the questions posed by the Committee, it had not commented on the question posed by the Committee concerning the territorial integrity of nations. The Committee decided to defer the application pending response to further questions by a member of the Committee.

Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights

11. At its 1998 session, the Committee had decided to defer the application of the Jammu and Kashmir Council for Human Rights and requested the organization to submit a revised application. At the 1999 session, the organization has been considered on the basis of the new application and deferred, pending receipt of official background information and a response to questions raised by the Committee. At the 2000 session, a Committee member had underlined that although the organization had provided a comprehensive response it had avoided answering some of the crucial questions, particularly those related to Article 2 (1) of the Charter of the United Nations, while others had not been answered at all. The Committee decided to defer the application of the organization, pending further clarification on questions asked by the Committee. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, the Committee decided to defer the application.

Africa for Christ International

12. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred consideration of Africa for Christ International, pending receipt of additional information to questions posed by the Committee. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, having been told that no response was received from the organization, the Committee asked the Secretariat to send another reminder to the organization and decided to defer consideration of the application.

African Community Resource Center

13. At its 2000 session, the Committee had decided to defer the application, pending a response from the organization to questions posed by the Committee. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, one Committee member noted that since his questions had not been fully answered the Committee was not in a position to take action. Another Committee member asked for clarification on the organization's projects in the southern Sudan. Having noted that the organization had made reference to cases of slavery in the northern Sudan, she asked the organization to clarify this issue and also to explain the nature of the organization South Sudan Friends International, which had been mentioned in the application of the organization. Another delegation requested further clarification on the organization's finances. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application, pending further information from the organization.

Korea International Volunteer Organization

14. At its 2000 session, the Committee had decided to defer the application, pending clarification. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, the Committee considered that the response provided by the organization was not clear. One Committee member asked clarification on the ties between the organization and the Government. The organization was also asked to explain what would be its contribution to the Council if granted consultative status. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application, pending a response to the questions posed by the Committee.

Relief International

15. At its 2000 session, the Committee deferred consideration of Relief International, pending receipt of additional clarification to questions posed by its

members. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, a Committee member noted that the organization referred to the Chechnya Republic, on its web site, which implied that it was not part of the Russian Federation. Another delegation asked for further information on the finances of the organization since the largest part of its income seemed to be from intergovernmental organizations. The Committee deferred consideration of the application, pending further clarification on the issues raised by the Committee.

Vishva Hindu Parishad

16. At its 1998 session, the Committee had considered the application of Vishva Hindu Parishad, which had been deferred to its 1999 session and subsequently to its 2000 session. One Committee member had expressed serious concern regarding the organization's philosophy and ideology, in particular its affiliation with the concept of "cultural Hinduism", one which he equated with Nazism and Fascism. The Committee had decided to defer consideration of the application to its next session. At its 2000 session, the Committee had reviewed the application. One Committee member had pointed out that according to Human Rights Watch, the organization's activists were at the forefront of violent acts against Christians. The Committee had decided to defer the application, pending questions posed by the Committee. At its 769th meeting, on 15 January, the Committee decided to defer the application of the organization, pending a written response to questions transmitted to the organization on 15 January 2001.

Le Foyer musulman — association internationale pour les droits de l'homme

17. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred its consideration of the application of Le Foyer musulman to its next session, requesting clarification on the "anti-slavery activities" of the organization and also on the various missions undertaken by the organization in the former USSR. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, a Committee member noted that in the information provided by the organization reference was made to the Chechnya Republic, which gave the impression that it was not a part of the Russian Federation. Another delegation questioned the organization's response concerning its not-for-profit status as it was listed in the Geneva commercial register. The Committee decided to defer action on the application, pending receipt of further clarification on these issues.

Management Science for Health

18. At its 2000 session, the Committee had deferred action on Management Science for Health, pending additional information from the organization. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, a Committee member underlined that the organization was an agency that executed contracts and therefore did not fall within the definition of a non-governmental organization. The Committee decided to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status.

Hadassah

19. At its 1999 session, the Committee, having reviewed the application and heard a representative of the organization respond to the questions posed by the Committee, had decided to defer consideration of the application, pending receipt of a written response from the organization to questions raised during the meeting. At its 2000 session, the Committee had decided to defer the application to the end of its session, pending clarification to questions posed by the Committee during the session, provided that a reply from the organization was received on time. An interim response had been received from the organization, informing the Committee that it could not respond to the questions posed by the Committee since its head staff was attending a board meeting abroad. One Committee member had then asked the organization to provide the Committee with a clear explanation for failing to attend the second part of its 2000 session. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application on the understanding that the debate on the application would be finalized at its 2000 resumed session.

20. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee had before it a response to questions posed by the Committee provided by the organization. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, the delegation of the United States, pursuant to rule 59 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council, requested in writing a roll-call vote on the proposal to recommend to the Council that the organization be granted consultative status. The Committee approved the proposal to recommend that the Council grant consultative status to the organization by a roll-call vote of nine in favour to five against, with three abstentions (see chap. I, draft decision I). The voting was as follows:

In favour:

Bolivia, Chile, Colombia, Ethiopia, France, Germany, Romania, Turkey, United States of America.

Against:

Algeria, Cuba, Lebanon, Pakistan, Sudan.

Abstaining:

China, India, Russian Federation.

Explanation of vote before the vote

21. The representative of Cuba expressed her surprise and disagreement regarding the procedure being followed in the case of this organization.

22. The representative of the Sudan in a statement said that she did not understand the procedure, and was surprised that the Committee had to proceed to a vote before considering the responses provided by the organization.

23. The delegation of Lebanon stated that the organization was involved in politically motivated acts against Member States of the United Nations and should not be granted consultative status, which would create a precedent.

24. The representative of Algeria made the following statement:

> "The Algerian delegation is surprised and astonished by this procedure of proceeding directly to a vote before the responses provided by the non-governmental organization concerned have even been discussed. Today's procedure sets a precedent. Accordingly, the Algerian delegation wishes to state, for the record, that should an identical situation arise in the future, it hopes that it would be handled no differently."

25. The representative of Germany made the following statement:

> "The question of whether or not this Committee should recommend consultative status to non-governmental organizations should be judged by the organization's work. This is why my delegation is of the opinion that Hadassah qualifies without any doubt for consultative status with the Council. Hadassah does commendable work, especially in the health sector, in many parts of the world. This Committee has often granted consultative status to non-governmental organizations whose points of views did not correspond or even were contrary to my Government's position. Germany thinks, however, that this is not a sufficient reason to exclude a non-governmental organization from participating in the work of the Council. Germany therefore supports Hadassah's application for consultative status and will vote in favour of it."

Explanation of vote after the vote

26. The representative of the Sudan stated that the procedure used in the Committee had set a new precedent. Her delegation reserved the right to follow the same procedure in other cases, as followed by the representative of the United States in the case of Hadassah.

27. The representative of France made the following statement:

> "At previous sessions, the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations undertook a detailed examination of the application submitted by the non-governmental organization Hadassah for consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.
>
> "We concluded, following numerous discussions and exchanges of views between the Committee members and the organization, that Hadassah satisfies the basic criteria for the granting of consultative status, particularly through its many humanitarian and medical activities.
>
> "Given the broad geographical scope of its work, the organization could use consultative status in the future to further develop and diversify its activities for the benefit of the greatest possible number of States Members of the United Nations.
>
> "It is for these reasons that the French delegation voted in favour of Hadassah's application."

28. The representative of Ethiopia declared that Hadassah had been working in Ethiopia for several years and that the organization was committed to humanitarian activities, which explained why his delegation had voted in favour of granting it consultative status.

29. The representative of Romania said that her delegation had voted in favour of Hadassah because it had a very wide scope of activities throughout the world, bringing together different peoples and cultures.

30. The representative of China stated that the procedure used in the case of Hadassah was neither transparent nor democratic and set a precedent for the future.

31. The representative of the Syrian Arab Republic made the following statement:

> "The delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic wishes to express its profound disappointment at the decision which the Committee has just taken. Syria, which has long played an active part in consultations between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations on the granting of consultative status, views this decision as a grave breach of the rules to which we agreed for the granting of consultative status to non-governmental organizations.
>
> "The pressure applied by one Committee member to secure approval for this organization violates the letter and the spirit of the agreed rules. We believe that such practices are inconsistent with the most basic values which ought to guide our work and ensure the success of the Committee's activities.
>
> "Syria has consistently supported the process of consultations between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations as serving to strengthen the role of the United Nations and enrich the various aspects of its work. However, we once again affirm that the goals and activities of the Hadassah organization, which has received the approval of a majority of the Committee thanks to the enormous pressure exerted by a certain Member State, are inconsistent with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31, insofar as the organization defends occupation against liberation and engages in racism which is denounced by the whole world.
>
> "The organization also acts in violation of international resolutions and has utterly failed to abide by United Nations resolutions relating to the Middle East and the peace process, particularly General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The documentation which the organization has provided clearly demonstrates its opposition to the Middle East peace process, particularly as regards the question of Jerusalem, one of the fundamental elements of that process.
>
> "Blind prejudice in favour of this organization serves neither the aims of the United Nations nor international cooperation. Such practices only complicate matters. We should like to make it clear that this matter will not pass unnoticed, as certain parties might have hoped, and that Syria will not allow the process of consultations between the United Nations and non-governmental organizations to be brought into disrepute.
>
> "We are clearly aware of the objectives behind the pressure which has been exerted. Anyone working for a just and comprehensive peace in the Middle East has to be just and impartial.
>
> "My delegation reiterates its profound disappointment at this decision and reaffirms its commitment to the success of the Committee's work, free from pressure and on the basis of just principles."

32. The representative of Palestine stated that she had followed the work of the Committee for a long time. Its working methods had been transparent and followed the United Nations rules and procedures. Her delegation regretted that for the first time that approach had been violated, which would set an unfortunate precedent when taking action on other organizations. Hadassah was not just a humanitarian organization but also a political one. The organization took positions on policies that were contradictory to United Nations resolutions.

33. The representative of Chile said that the correct procedure had been followed in the consideration of Hadassah. His delegation had voted in favour of recommending status for the organization because it operated in keeping with the principles stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31.

34. The representative of Israel stated the following:

> "I wish to express my gratitude to you and the members of this Committee for your

important and courageous action taken here today in granting the Hadassah organization NGO consultative status within the United Nations. Although our delegation is most satisfied with the final outcome of today's meeting, we remain outraged by certain statements made in the course of deliberations on this issue. We had hoped that the anti-Semitic and anti-Zionist rhetoric of the past had been erased. We had hoped that the singling out of Israel and Jewish organizations had become a thing of the past. We are saddened to discover that we were wrong. Thus, while we welcome the Committee's decision, we categorically reject the statements of certain members, who prefer to perpetuate a fruitless campaign of defamation and propaganda. We sincerely hope that as we enter the new millennium, the United Nations will act to uproot the discriminatory elements from within this organization, and will continue to move forward towards fulfilling its mandate to resolve conflict and foster peace and understanding among all the peoples of the world, in accordance with its Charter."

National Center for Missing and Exploited Children

35. At its 1999 and 2000 sessions, the Committee had deferred consideration of the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, pending receipt of further information. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, one Committee member asked the organization to explain its link with the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation. Another delegation asked for further clarification of the organization's financial situation since it had received funds from several branches of government in the United States. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the application, pending further information on the questions raised by the Committee.

36. At its 770th meeting, on 16 January, the Committee decided not to recommend two organizations for consultative status with the Council, as described below.

National Opinion Research Center

37. The Committee noted that the organization had undertaken impressive and laudable activities. However, a number of delegations pointed out that the organization's activities were research-related and that its primary activities were carried out under contractual arrangements with other entities. The organization did not meet the criteria stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31. The Committee decided to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Olabisi Olaleye

38. A number of Committee members did not find the organization's response satisfactory. One Committee member pointed out that the financial situation of the organization was unclear and that he was unable to understand the nature of its activities. The Committee decided to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I).

2. Requests for reclassification for consultative status deferred from previous sessions (1998 and 1999)

39. At its 771st meeting, on 16 January, the Committee considered two requests for reclassification deferred from previous sessions.

International PEN

40. At its 1998 and 1999 sessions, the Committee had considered a request for reclassification to special consultative status from International PEN, an organization on the Roster. At its 1999 resumed session, the representative of Cuba had stated that the organization was actively interfering in the internal affairs of her country, and that it had relationships with individuals or groups engaged in illegal activities in her country. The Committee had deferred consideration of the request of the organization because it was not yet in a position to make a decision on that application.

41. At its 771st meeting, on 16 January, a number of delegations noted that a number of respected intellectuals were represented on the organization's board. However, there was no consensus on the application. The representative of Cuba found the response provided by the organization on its trip to Cuba unsatisfactory. She asked for further information on the organization's activities in Cuba, particularly during the week when the representatives of the organization had entered Cuba on tourist visas. She requested additional information on the "fact-finding"

missions of the organization in Cuba, and wanted to know which Cuban authorities had been contacted during these missions. A number of delegations underlined that the organization had already apologized for entering Cuba on a tourist visa and made clear that it would not happen again. Some delegations felt that this issue should not be revisited year after year. Another Committee member noted that the organization has a particular area of specialization and was on the Roster status of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). He felt that it was a case of reclassification and the Committee should wait for a consensus decision on this aspect. After a lengthy debate, the Committee decided to defer consideration of the request for reclassification, pending additional information from the organization.

International Peace Bureau

42. At its 1999 session, the Committee had decided to defer the request for reclassification of the International Peace Bureau, an organization on the Roster, pending further clarification to questions posed by the Committee on its high administration expenditures and receipt of government funding. At the 771st meeting, on 16 January, a number of delegations raised questions on the umbrella nature of the organization and its relation with another organization, the Hague Appeal for Peace, applying for consultative status at the same session. Pursuant to the fact that a non-governmental organization asking for consultative status should not be involved in political activities, several delegations questioned the affiliation of the organization with political organizations.

43. The representative of the organization, responding to the questions posed by the Committee, said that her organization was over 120 years old and had won the Nobel Prize in 1910. It was an international network of peace and disarmament organizations, which had played an active role in promoting the work of the United Nations. It was one of the founding members of the Hague Appeal for Peace and the representative had been elected President of both organizations. She reminded the Committee that the Hague Appeal for Peace had asked for postponement of consideration of its application. She explained that her organization also focused on human rights and gender education and worked closely with UNESCO. She listed the United Nations conferences and meetings in which her organization participated over the past five years. She could not provide an explanation regarding the reference to "political organizations" mentioned in the reclassification application. The application had been sent by the previous president of the organization, whom she would contact on that issue to provide further clarification to the Committee. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the request for reclassification, pending a further response by the organization.

B. New applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification

44. The Committee considered new applications for consultative status and new requests for reclassification at its 772nd to 780th, 783rd, 785th and 786th meetings, on 17 to 26 January.

1. New applications for consultative status

45. The Committee considered new applications pending from the first and second parts of its 2000 session at its 772nd to 780th, 783rd, 785th and 786th meetings, on 17 to 26 January.

In Honor of Mandela Fund

46. At its 773rd meeting, on 17 January, the Committee considered the application of the organization In Honor of Mandela Fund. The Observer Member of South Africa stated that although the United States-based organization had commendable activities, his delegation was concerned regarding the fact that the organization had not yet received approval to use the Mandela name, for which his country had regulations. In addition, his delegation had no record of any of the 20 projects the organization mentioned it had undertaken in South Africa.

47. The representative of the organization, responding to the concerns and questions raised on the work of her organization, informed the Committee that the organization's lawyer was in contact with Mr. Mandela's attorney to try and address the issue. On the issue of the implementation of projects, she said that they had been put on hold until the issue of the use of the Mandela name was resolved. The Committee

decided to defer consideration of the application until the issue of the use of the name Mandela is resolved.

Pioneer People Trust

48. At its 774th meeting, on 18 January, the Committee considered the application of Pioneer People Trust. A number of delegations raised questions on the nature of the organization and what would be its contribution to the Council if it was granted consultative status. The nature of the membership was also questioned. The representative of the organization answered those questions, explaining that since submitting the original application the organization had expanded its activities. He also added that the organization had a Christian origin but was registered as a charitable organization. The programmes of the organization were carried out independently of the religious beliefs of the people participating in the programmes. The Committee requested that Pioneer People Trust provide an updated version of its activities to the Committee. The Committee deferred consideration of the application, pending receipt of the new information to be provided by the organization.

Kyrgyz Committee for Human Rights

49. At its 776th meeting, on 19 January, the Committee considered the application of the Kyrgyz Committee for Human Rights. A number of delegations raised questions on the amount of grants received by the organization and requested a list of contributors to the financing of the organization's activities. A Committee member stressed that the organization's application had mentioned several activities with political implications.

50. The representative of the organization explained that it had submitted proposals for specific projects when seeking grants and would provide a list of funders. His organization provided assistance to the poor and also to refugees in Kyrgyzstan. In response to a question regarding the organization's assistance to those suffering human rights violations, he said that his organization did not pursue any political ends. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the organization, pending receipt of information requested by the Committee and clearance of the Government of Kyrgyzstan, which response was subsequently received and will be circulated to the members of the Committee.

Wales Assembly of Women

51. At its 776th meeting, on 19 January, the Committee considered the application of the Wales Assembly of Women. A number of delegations noted that 80 per cent of the expenditures of the organization went to the salary of a part-time development officer and the organization did not seem to undertake any project. The Committee deferred consideration of the application, pending receipt from the organization of a list of its "specific" projects.

Jubilee Campaign

52. At its 777th meeting, on 19 January, the Committee considered the application of the Jubilee Campaign. One Committee member noted that the organization's activities focused on the research and investigation of reported allegations of human rights abuses. A number of Committee members requested the organization's reports on their countries. The Committee deferred consideration of the application, pending receipt of the reports.

International Society for Human Rights

53. At its 778th meeting, on 22 January, the Committee reviewed the application of the International Society for Human Rights. A number of delegations expressed reservations about the activities of the organization. One delegation asked the organization to explain what it meant by the word "persecution". A number of delegations objected to the fact that their countries were listed and ranked on the organization's web site as countries persecuting individuals on the basis of their religion. Another delegation requested a breakdown of "other sources" of income.

54. The delegation of Cuba made the following statement:

> "My delegation has carefully considered this organization's application for consultative status and its replies to the questions posed by the Committee during the informal consultations held in May 2000. We have also visited the organization's web site, and I must say that my delegation has serious concerns about it, since there are sufficient grounds to indicate that its activities are politically motivated.

"Serving as Vice-President on the international board of this organization is a Mr. Ricardo Bofill, who is avowedly and openly hostile to the Government of my country and whose activities are aimed at subverting the internal order of Cuba. To that end, Mr. Bofill has ties to and coordinates his activities with illegal organizations in Cuba and organizations abroad which carry out activities against my country aimed at overthrowing its legitimately and constitutionally established Government through various methods and means.

"Mr. Bofill, Vice-President of the International Society for Human Rights, is also President of one of the organizations to which I am referring, the so-called Comité Cubano Pro Derechos Humanos, which has its headquarters in Miami, in the United States of America, from which it carries out a whole range of anti-Cuban activities.

"To give just one example, Mr. Bofill is a member of the Comité de Proyectos Especiales (Special Projects Committee) of an organization known as the Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Friedrich Hayek, also located in Miami, whose request for consultative status this Committee rejected scarcely a year ago upon discovering its ties to terrorist organizations which attack my country.

"Last May, in one of the questions it posed, my delegation specifically sought a detailed description of Mr. Bofill's duties, functions and activities in his capacity as Vice-President of the International Society for Human Rights. However, the Society's response is very brief and unenlightening; in fact, it does not answer our question. **My delegation therefore wishes to repeat its question and requests the organization to give the fullest and most detailed possible reply.**

"In its brief reply, the Society states that its Vice-Presidents are elected on the basis of geographical criteria, as they are responsible for the activities of the Society's sections or groups in neighbouring countries, and that Mr. Bofill is President of the Society's Pan American Committee. In this connection, **my delegation wonders which regional sections or groups comprise the Pan American Committee. We would also be interested in knowing what type of activities the Society carries out in Latin America, in which countries and whether it conducts any activities in Cuba.**

"Moreover, we have noted that the Society's web page publishes articles that are utterly defamatory and devoid of all objectivity. They are a real insult to the Government and people of Cuba and unacceptably call into question the current system and constitutional and legislative order in Cuba. In this connection, **my delegation wishes to know what sources of information the Society uses in preparing and publishing such articles. Does the Society verify the truthfulness of its information and the credibility of its sources before publishing?**

"I am also constrained to point out that the web page includes an article containing an accusation made by the Comité Cubano Pro Derechos Humanos and supported by the Society, which insolently libels and attacks the Ambassador of Cuba accredited to the international organizations based in Geneva. The article quotes word for word Mr. Bofill's unscrupulous defamation of the Cuban Ambassador, which is explicitly endorsed by the Society. **My delegation would appreciate an explanation in this regard, as well as details of the relationship between the Society and the so-called Comité Cubano Pro Derechos Humanos. At the same time, we would like the organization to explain to us how its attitude and activities with regard to Cuba conform to the requirements laid down in resolution 1996/31 governing the activities and conduct of non-governmental organizations enjoying consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.**

"My delegation apologizes for having had to take up several minutes of your time and that of the distinguished members of this Committee; however, we felt it was necessary to make some comments on the organization in question, about which my delegation has very serious concerns.

"Nonetheless, since delegations other than Cuba also have concerns and questions and this is the first time that an application from the

organization in question has been submitted for consideration by the Committee, and since the members of this Committee are always anxious for an opportunity to hear and discuss the replies of non-governmental organizations to their questions, my delegation will be flexible and will be more than willing to submit its questions in writing to the Secretariat for transmittal to the Society."

55. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the organization, pending receipt of a response from the organization to the questions posed by the Committee.

Mandat international

56. At its 777th meeting, on 19 January, having reviewed the activities of the organization, the Committee, while recognizing that the organization was undertaking impressive and useful work, did not believe that it was currently contributing to the work of the Council, and decided to recommend that the Council not grant consultative status to the organization, without prejudice to its highly useful ongoing work (see chap. I, draft decision I).

International Lesbian and Gay Association

57. At its 785th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee considered the application of the International Lesbian and Gay Association (ILGA), an international organization previously on the Roster. The organization's consultative status had been suspended in 1994 pursuant to Council resolution 1994/50 in response to concerns raised concerning member organizations or subsidiaries of ILGA which promoted or condoned paedophilia. At its 1998 session, the Committee had received a letter from the organization requesting reinstatement of its status. The Committee had deferred the matter to its resumed 1998 session, at which it had decided to ask the organization to submit a new application for consultative status which the Committee would examine at a future session (see E/1998/72). Having reviewed the application, a number of delegations raised questions about the registration status of the organization. Other delegations requested the organization to explain to the Committee how it could guarantee that its members did not promote paedophilia. A Committee member asked the organization how it screened its member organizations and subsidiaries to ensure that they did not promote paedophilia. Another delegation requested the organization to provide the list of member organizations expelled by ILGA which had condoned paedophilia in the past. Another delegation questioned the nature of affiliation of the government organizations affiliated to ILGA. One Committee member wished to find out whether some of the member organizations of ILGA had already been granted consultative status with the Council.

Hague Appeal for Peace

58. At its 2000 session, the Committee had raised questions about the organization's registration in two different countries. At its 2000 resumed session, the Committee expressed concerns about the structure of the organization and its relationship with another organization, the International Peace Bureau, an organization requesting reclassification. Committee members questioned the need for the Hague Appeal for Peace to apply for consultative status when the International Peace Bureau, the umbrella organization to which the Hague Appeal for Peace was affiliated to, had already been granted consultative status with the Council. The Committee noted that the organization had asked for a deferment of its application. At its 772nd meeting, on 17 January, the Committee decided to close consideration of the organization's application (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Youth Federation for World Peace

59. The Committee was not satisfied by the response provided by the organization to its questions. A number of Committee members expressed dissatisfaction that the response of the organization had come to the Committee through an attorney who appeared to be raising unrelated issues. One Committee member expressed the view that the response was null and void. Concern was also expressed about the organization's link with the Unification Church. At its 773rd meeting, on 17 January, the Committee decided to close the file of the organization, without prejudice (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Mountain Women Development Organization

60. At its 775th meeting, on 18 January, one Committee member raised the question of the use of inaccurate names for certain territories by the organization in its application. The territories have recognized names used in United Nations terminology.

The case was deferred, pending corrections to be made in the application.

61. The Committee decided to defer the following applications, pending further information to questions raised by the Committee at its resumed 2000 session:

Alliance musulmane d'Angola

American Motorcyclist Association

Amities sans frontières

Argentina Association of International Law

Center for Policy Alternatives

Community of Sant'Egidio

Consumer World Organization

Elizabeth Seton Federation

Global Crop Protection Federation

International Energy Foundation

International Commission on Distance Education

Leadership for Environment and Development

Non-Aligned Youth and Student Organization

Russian Public Movement "For civil rights"

United Nations Watch

62. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not review the applications of the following non-governmental organizations:

A Centre for the World Religions

Abdul Momen Khan Memorial Foundation

Africa Infrastructures Foundation

American Society of Safety Engineers

Antioch Christian Centre

Association mauritanienne pour le bien-être et le secours de l'enfant et de la mère

Benevolent Community Education and Rural Development

Center for Practice-oriented Feminist Science

Centre africain de recherche industrielle

Centre féminine pour la promotion du développement

Comité international pour le respect et l'application de la Charte africaine des droits de l'homme et des peuples

Cooperation Ireland

Dominicans for Justice and Peace — Order of Preachers

European Association of Automotive Suppliers

European Institute

European Roman Rights Center

Family Research Council

Family Welfare in Brazil Civil Society

Federation of Ijaw Communities

Felege Guihon International

Femme — jeunesse — environnement-santé

Girls' Power Initiative

Gun Control Australia

Human Rights Information and Documentation Systems International

International Center for Not-for-Profit Law

International Communities for the Renewal of the Earth

International Religious Liberty Association

International Society of Doctors for the Environment

Kitakyushu on Asian Women Foundation

Marmara Group Strategic and Social Research Foundation

Millennium Institute

Motorcycle Riders Foundation

Network of East-West Women

Partage

Population Reference Bureau

Swedish Organization of Disabled Persons International Aid Association

Tebtebba Foundation — Indigenous Peoples' International Centre for Policy Research and Education

United World Colleges

University of Missouri Kansas City Women's Council

Vaestoliitto The Family Federation of Finland

Women's Board Educational Cooperation Society

Women's Voice International

World Animal Net

World Council for Psychotherapy

2. New requests for reclassification

63. At its 786th meeting, on 26 January, the Committee considered new requests for reclassification.

64. The Committee decided to reclassify two organizations from special to general consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Armenian Relief Society

65. At its 786th meeting, on 26 January, the Committee deferred consideration of the request for reclassification of the Armenian Relief Society, an organization placed on the Roster, pending response from the organization to questions raised by the Committee.

International Association of Charities

66. At the same meeting, the Committee decided to defer consideration of International Association of Charities, an organization placed in the Roster by virtue of its consultative status with UNESCO, pending the outcome of the debate of the Committee on the question of granting consultative status with the Council to non-governmental organizations placed on the Roster by virtue of their consultative status with other United Nations bodies or specialized agencies.

Fundación Pro Derechos de la Familia

67. Also at the same meeting, the Committee considered the request for reclassification of the Fundación Pro Derechos de la Familia and decided to recommend that it not be reclassified to general consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Movement for a Better World
World Safety Organization

68. Due to time constraints, the Committee did not review the requests for reclassification of the Movement for a Better World and the World Safety Organization, which were deferred to the 2001 session.

III. Review of quadrennial reports submitted by non-governmental organizations in general and special status with the Economic and Social Council

69. Under agenda item 6, the Committee had before it a note by the Secretary-General containing quadrennial reports, 1994-1997 and 1995-1998, submitted through the Secretary-General pursuant to Council resolution 1996/31 (E/C.2/2000/2 and Add.1) and a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing a compilation of deferred quadrennial reports (E/C.2/2000/CRP.2). Owing to time constraints, the Committee decided to postpone consideration of the item.

IV. Implementation of Economic and Social Council decision 1996/302

70. The Committee considered agenda item 5 at its 782nd meeting, on 24 January 2001. It had before it a memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications from non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development to expand their participation in other fields of the work of the Council (E/C.2/2000/CRP.7), pursuant to Council decision 1996/302.

71. At its 1999 resumed session, held in January 2000, one delegation proposed that non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development which intended to expand their participation in other fields of the Economic and Social Council should in future submit a formal request to the Non-Governmental Organizations Section of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, in accordance with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31.

72. At its 782nd meeting, on 24 January, the Committee reviewed this issue and had before it a note by the Secretariat listing the 539 non-governmental organizations accredited to the Commission on Sustainable Development, of which 101 organizations had already been placed on the Roster pursuant to Council decision 1996/302. Committee members expressed the view that the non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development had in the past been granted consultative status without having to submit to the Secretariat the requisite questionnaire and other documents submitted by organizations applying for Roster consultative status with the Council. Members felt that the existing procedure discriminated against other organizations, who followed normal procedure as stipulated in Council resolution 1996/31.

73. The Committee expressed the view that the whole procedure should be reviewed. Concern was also expressed by Committee members that the Secretariat did not have any file or documents proving the existence and activities of non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development, except for a simple form showing the name of these organizations and their contact numbers. Committee members agreed that there was an anomaly between applications from these organizations and other applications.

74. One delegation noted that, in its decision 1996/302, the Council had referred only to its decision 1993/220, which had been adopted earlier than Council resolution 1996/31. Therefore, if considered in that chronological order, it could be understood, from a legal point of view, that Council decision 1996/302 was regulatory in nature and that in future the Committee should only take into account Council resolution 1996/31 and the application criteria contained therein.

75. It seemed that there was a need for procedures to be streamlined, and the Committee agreed that the Chairman would seek a clarification from the Office of Legal Counsel of the Secretariat on the questions raised during the discussion and present the reply to the Committee at its 2001 session. It also requested the Secretariat to prepare a background paper on the matter to reflect the various views expressed in the Committee. The Committee also requested that consultations be conducted with the secretariat of the Commission on Sustainable Development to confirm whether the list containing the 539 non-governmental organizations accredited to the Commission on Sustainable Development was still an active list used by the Commission on Sustainable Development. It was also decided that the issue would be added to the agenda of the working group of the Committee, which would consider all aspects of the issue and make recommendations to the Committee.

V. Consideration of special reports

76. The Committee considered item 7 at its 784th and 785th meetings, on 25 January 2001. It had before it a note by the Secretary-General containing the special reports of the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation (UTNSC) and the World Confederation of Labour (E/C.2/2000/3) requested by the Committee, as well as several complaints by the States concerned.

A. Special reports

United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation

77. At its 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a complaint by the representative of Cuba to the Commission on Human Rights regarding the accreditation in Geneva by the International Council of the Associations for Peace in the Continents (ASOPAZCO) of a number of persons at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission who, according to the delegation of Cuba, had "followed clear patterns of violations against the provisions included in Council resolution 1996/31". Noting the ties between UTNSC and ASOPAZCO, the Committee, pursuant to paragraph 61 (c) of Council resolution 1996/31, had requested UTNSC to submit a special report on its activities to the Committee at its resumed 2000 session. In particular, the Committee had requested information on the activities undertaken between UTNSC and ASOPAZCO.

78. At its 784th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee had before it a special report submitted by the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation, as well as a letter from the organization submitting additional information responding to the questions posed by the delegation of Cuba on the special report circulated among Committee members.

79. The representative of Cuba stated that her delegation was not satisfied with the report submitted by UTNSC because it did not respond to the questions asked by her delegation. She added that since she had just received the document containing the additional information in English, she would have to study it further. She added that parts of the report were contradictory as far as the relationship between UTNSC and ASOPAZCO was concerned. She needed additional clarification and requested that the organization respond to her questions in writing. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the special report of UTNSC, pending receipt of a written response from the organization to the questions raised by the delegation of Cuba. The representative of the organization was present at the discussion.

World Confederation of Labour

80. At its 1998 resumed session, the Committee had had before it the special report of the World Confederation of Labour (WCL). The observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran had not been satisfied with the report of the organization and had requested additional information and the presence of a representative of the organization at the 1999 session.

81. At the 1999 session, the Committee had been briefed by a representative of the organization, who proposed a dialogue with the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations Office at Geneva. The Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran had welcomed the proposal and asked the Committee to request a new special report from the organization for its next session to answer the questions raised. At its 2000 session, the Committee had been informed by the organization that discussions were still ongoing between WCL and the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The Observer delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran had requested that the organization not accredit in the future individuals wrongly accredited in 1998 and that it freeze its activities until the investigation was completed. At its 784th meeting, on 25 January, having read the letter of the organization, the delegate of the Islamic Republic of Iran declared that his delegation was satisfied with the response from the organization. However, he said that his delegation will, in the future, provide a list of individuals to WCL who should not be accredited by the organization. He also underlined that the Democratic Union of Iranian Workers (DUIW) was a political organization, with affiliation to terrorist groups. He appealed to WCL to "expel" DUIW from its membership and his delegation reserved the right to reopen this issue. The Committee decided to close the case (see chap. I, draft decision I).

B. Complaints submitted by States

Freedom House

82. At the first part of its 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a complaint by the delegation of China against Freedom House and a letter addressed by the delegation to the Director-General of the United Nations Office at Geneva, as well as the Director-General's response. The letter had stated that the organization had invited anti-China elements to hold a panel discussion directed against the Chinese Government, and had requested and obtained interpretation provided by the United Nations for this meeting. The organization had been requested to present a special report on its activities at its June 2000 session.

83. At the second part of its 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a special report and a response from Freedom House explaining the incident. The Committee had heard the representative of the organization, who had responded to questions on the matter. A number of delegations had requested clarification concerning the work of the organization, including its structure and decision-making mechanisms, its links to the United States Government and its financial structure. The Committee had deferred consideration of the complaint to its 2000 resumed session, pending the receipt of a response by the organization to the questions posed by the Committee. The Chairman of the Committee had been requested to address a letter to the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, requesting a report on the outcome of the inquiry carried out by the United Nations Secretariat in Geneva. At its 784th meeting, the Committee had before it a response from the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, a response from the organization to the questions posed by the Committee and a letter from the organization concerning the incident. In addition, the Committee had also a letter from the organization concerning the incident.

84. The representative of China made the following statement:

"During the 2000 session of the Committee, the Chinese delegation charged that the non-governmental organization Freedom House had improperly obtained interpretation service during the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights. In order to arrive at a clearer understanding of this 'interpretation incident', the Committee agreed to defer its consideration of the Chinese delegation's complaint pending the response of Freedom House to questions about what had taken place, and requested the United Nations Office at Geneva to submit its own investigative report on the incident.

"The Chinese delegation has thoroughly studied the investigative report submitted by the Geneva secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, as well as the responses provided by Freedom House to the questions posed by the Committee. A comparison of these responses, especially those provided by the organization on two occasions in June 2000, with the report on the inquiry carried out by the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights indicates that Freedom House did indeed fail to abide by the relevant provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, that its actions violated the basic moral standards of honesty and credibility and that its responsibility for the 'interpretation incident' could not be shrugged off.

"In order to explain what actually took place in the 'interpretation incident', it is necessary to clarify two issues:

"First, did the representative of Freedom House make absolutely clear at all times that he represented a non-governmental organization?

"In its responses to questions posed by the Committee, Freedom House claimed that at no time during the entire process of requesting interpretation services from the Secretariat had its representative concealed his identity. It further claimed that he had made clear at all times that he was the representative of a non-governmental organization, that the forum in question was a non-governmental organization activity and that he had identified himself accordingly without fail throughout the Commission's session. According to the secretariat report, however, the Freedom House representative had telephoned the interpretation service and requested Chinese/English interpretation for a consultation meeting on China, without specifying that it was a meeting organized by a non-governmental organization.

"Second, did the Freedom House representative specify at all times that the activity in question was a 'panel discussion' or 'forum' organized by a non-governmental organization?

"In its responses to questions posed by the Committee on 22 June 2000, Freedom House did not admit that it had characterized the activity as a 'consultation', saying that it had made clear to officials of the United Nations Office at Geneva that the event was a 'panel discussion'. In its responses to questions posed by the Committee on 9 June 2000, Freedom House claimed that 'its representative had informed the interpreter of the details regarding the forum'. In other words, it claimed that it had never characterized the event as a 'consultation meeting'. However, the secretariat report describes the Freedom House representative as asking for Chinese/English interpretation 'for a consultation meeting on China'.

"In its responses to questions posed by the Committee in June 2000, Freedom House insisted that it had committed no errors with regard to the 'interpretation incident'. However, the secretariat report states that on the day after the incident, the Freedom House representative 'expressed his regrets and said that since he was attending the Commission for the first time, he was not aware of all the procedures'.

"As made clear by the foregoing, there are serious discrepancies between the responses of Freedom House and the secretariat report. It is certain that one of the two accounts must be untrue; in other words, one of the parties is lying. In our view, the liar is Freedom House. The Chinese delegation is of the opinion that what happened in the 'interpretation incident' is very clear: when requesting the services of the Interpretation Service, the representative of Freedom House did not clearly identify himself as

the representative of a non-governmental organization, nor did he clearly specify that the activity for which he was requesting interpretation service was sponsored by a non-governmental organization. In so doing, he had misled the chief of the Interpretation Service into providing interpretation services for that activity. We are confident that all objective and unbiased delegations would arrive at the same conclusion with regard to the 'interpretation incident', i.e. that Freedom House fraudulently obtained interpretation services and its responsibility for so doing cannot be shrugged off.

"Furthermore, we note that when the secretariat transmitted its list of questions to Freedom House on 22 June, Freedom House responded on the very same day. While the alacrity of that response is commendable, it also leads us to wonder whether the response could possibly have been prepared on the basis of a thorough and responsible investigation.

"As a non-governmental organization that has enjoyed consultative status with the Economic and Social Council for more than five years, Freedom House should be familiar with and conscientiously observe the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31 and the relevant rules of procedure, and should also treat the relevant inquiries of the Committee with a supportive and cooperative attitude. However, we both regret and fail to understand the continuing refusal of Freedom House to face the facts, and its inability to honestly recognize its error. What arouses even greater indignation is the fact that throughout the Committee's discussion and investigation of the 'interpretation incident', Freedom House has gone so far as to engage in unbridled and irresponsible attacks on and slander of the Committee and its members, classifying the States members of the Committee as 'democratic' or 'undemocratic', fomenting discord among the members and attempting to prevent the Committee from carrying out its work in a fair and objective manner. Such frantic attempts at deception in order to evade punishment deserve to be unanimously condemned by all members of the Committee, and deserve as well to end in humiliating defeat.

"In the view of the Chinese delegation, the irrefutable evidence of the violation by Freedom House of the spirit of Council resolution 1996/31 and the relevant rules of procedure brooks no denial. We feel that the Committee should take the necessary measures to punish Freedom House. We wish to stress that punishment is not the goal in this instance; rather, our objective is to encourage, support and confirm non-governmental organizations in their adherence to the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant resolutions and rules of procedure when participating in the activities of United Nations bodies, in order that they might make useful contributions to the work of the Organization. We hope that Freedom House will be able to face the facts, admit its errors and correct its behaviour.

"We have received the facsimile letter transmitted by Freedom House to the Chairman of the Committee. In view of the fact that this happens to be the traditional Chinese New Year's holiday, my delegation is unable to seek instructions from its Government, so I can only make a few preliminary comments regarding this letter and reserve the right to make further observations.

"First, because Freedom House has never had the courage to face the facts and admit its errors, we have come to doubt that organization's credibility. In its facsimile letter, Freedom House admits that different explanations exist for the 'interpretation incident', but it fails to deal with the reasons giving rise to them. Two explanations for the 'interpretation incident' certainly exist; one is contained in the secretariat report, and the other is contained in the responses of Freedom House to the questions posed by the Committee. In our view, the reason for the existence of two different explanations lies precisely in the inability of Freedom House to provide an accurate account, in its lack of the courage to tell the truth and admit the errors it committed and in its persistent attempts to evade responsibility for its actions. If Freedom House cannot tell the truth even in a situation where the facts are as unambiguous as they are in the present instance, how can we believe that it will be capable of providing fair, objective and truthful information with regard to other issues?

"Second, Freedom House has admitted that during the 2000 session of the Commission on Human Rights, its representative violated the relevant United Nations procedures, but it insists that the violation was nothing more than an unintentional technical error. In our view, whether or not a violation is intentional, or indeed whether it is technical or otherwise in nature, a violation is nevertheless a violation. The improper actions of the Freedom House representative misled secretariat personnel into providing interpretation service for the event with which he was involved. In our view, such covering-up of mistakes rather than honestly admitting them once again reveals that Freedom House possesses neither the ability to learn from its errors nor the most elementary sense of morality and honesty. We doubt whether an organization so lacking in basic morality could make much of a contribution to the work of the Economic and Social Council.

"Third, we welcome the assertion by Freedom House that it intends to familiarize its members with the rules governing the participation of non-governmental organizations in the activities of the United Nations. The Chinese delegation has consistently held that non-governmental organizations should respect the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and strictly abide by Council resolution 1996/31 and other relevant regulations and rules of procedure, so as to participate concretely and positively in the activities of the United Nations system. We shall watch to see whether their deeds match their words, and closely observe their behaviour henceforth, while reserving the right to take further measures.

"Moreover, as we have found that Taiwan is frequently referred to as an independent country on the Freedom House web page, we request a written explanation from Freedom House of its position with regard to the question of Taiwan."

85. The Ambassador of Cuba made the following statement:

"My delegation has considered with particular interest the responses given by the organization to my country's complaint and to the questions posed by the Committee in June of last year. We should like to state quite frankly that we are not swayed by the arguments developed by the organization in its replies.

"In response to the complaint made by Cuba concerning the accreditation of Ms. María Domínguez, the organization makes a statement defending that individual, presenting her as a 'distinguished lawyer and expert in human rights'. It is not our intention to challenge such claims, but we are absolutely sure of the fact that Ms. Domínguez is a member of an organization, the so-called 'Universidad Latinoamericana de la Libertad Friedrich Hayek', whose request for consultative status was rejected by this Committee when proof of its ties with terrorist organizations that attack my country was established.

"We cannot agree with the organization's assertion in its reply that Ms. Domínguez was invited in her personal capacity and not as a representative of any other organization and that, therefore, her presence did not in any way influence the behaviour of Freedom House as an organization.

"We should like to stress that in fact the behaviour of Freedom House as an organization is clearly hostile and aggressive towards my country and that the accreditation of Ms. Domínguez, a well known activist against the Government of Cuba, as a member of the delegation of that organization to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights is in line with the traditional position and politically-motivated activities of Freedom House against our country. To cite just one example, Ms. María Domínguez was one of the speakers at a Freedom House-sponsored anti-Cuban panel that was convened within the framework of the meetings of the Commission.

"As far as the replies to the Committee's questions are concerned, my delegation finds them inadequate; in some cases, the organization fails to reply to the questions asked. Moreover, some of the replies raise new questions. In that regard, my delegation would like to ask the organization to elaborate further on its reply or to provide adequate responses to the questions it was asked. As to the new questions, we will

gladly submit them in writing to the Secretariat for transmittal to the organization.

"The Cuban delegation, which particularly welcomes the very important role of non-governmental organizations and their significant contribution to the work of the United Nations, as well as their efforts to defend and promote the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, believes that such organizations have a fundamental obligation to respect the norms and procedures governing their relations with the United Nations.

"However, the behaviour and activities of Freedom House are very far from complying with the most elementary rules and principles that non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council are required to observe and respect. In fact, the behaviour of that organization violates the provisions of resolution 1996/31.

"This is not a new issue. It should be recalled that the Committee's concerns, doubts and objections about the organization were clearly indicated from the very moment when it considered the request by Freedom House for consultative status in 1995, a request which was rejected. Unfortunately, the Economic and Social Council later rescinded that decision following intense lobbying and pressure by the United States delegation on many of its members.

"My delegation has sufficient evidence of the political motives behind the activities that this organization has historically been carrying out against my country. Such activities are designed to subvert the internal order and overthrow the legitimate and constitutionally established Government of Cuba.

"The Cuban Government has repeatedly denounced this organization's blatant interference in Cuba's internal affairs.

"Behind the extravagant media marketing of Freedom House as a promoter of 'democratic values' and its status as a 'non-profit organization' lurks a subversive organization which is more akin to an intelligence service than to a non-governmental organization. Its activities against Cuba provide ample proof of this, since such activities range from material support for groups operating illegally in my country in the service of a foreign Government to the promotion, organization and funding of espionage activities against Cuba.

"During all these years, Freedom House has maintained a very hostile and aggressive attitude towards my country. To that end, huge amounts of funds have been channelled to it by the United States Government and Congress through the so-called National Endowment for Democracy, with the aim of promoting internal subversion, undermining our constitutional order and destroying the Cuban Government.

"The involvement of the Freedom House organization in the most recent Cuba programme created by the United States Government to destabilize our revolution by fostering internal subversion, under section 109 of the Helms-Burton Act of 1996, began in 1997 with the 'Transition' project, which received generous funding from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to the tune of $500 million; that was followed by a further $275 million in 1999, which was increased in 2000 to $550 million. The initial programme gave rise to the emergence of an anti-Cuban centre called the 'Centre for a Free Cuba' which is directed by Frank Calzón, a Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) agent and former Director of the Cuba Democracy Project of Freedom House. The Centre has already received more than a million dollars from USAID for similar purposes.

"The basic areas of work of the current Freedom House programme include identifying, recruiting and sending to Cuba, in order to commit acts of destabilization and subversion, politicians, journalists and activists from Eastern and Central Europe with experience in so-called 'democratic transition', a term used to refer to the destruction of socialist governments.

"USAID publicly acknowledged in June 2000 that Freedom House had organized the visit to Cuba of four journalists, four parliamentarians, two economists and an academic from Eastern Europe, all of whom were financed and trained with United States Government funds for subversive purposes.

"The following are a few of the most recent examples in this regard:

- On 9 June 2000, a Polish citizen and a Romanian citizen arrived in my country with tourist visas. They had been selected in their respective countries by Freedom House to participate in the USAID-financed 'Cuba Democracy Project'. They claimed that they had been briefed in Washington, where they had held meetings with executives of Freedom House as well as USAID and Department of State officials. In accordance with the plan devised by Freedom House, after carrying out their subversive activities in Cuba, these emissaries would once more be received in Washington for further contacts with this organization;

- On 31 October 2000, two Latvian citizens travelling on tourist visas arrived in Cuba from the United States of America. They had been in contact with individuals belonging to groups that operate illegally in our country. A number of anti-Cuban documents, rolls of film, many receipts of payments effected in Cuba and $1,098 given to them by Freedom House were found in their possession. These individuals had been received in Washington by Robert Pontichera, the director of Freedom House, who briefed them on the work they had to carry out in Cuba and gave them a list of persons operating illegally in our country to contact;

- It was this same Freedom House official, Robert Pontichera, who briefed and gave instructions to the Czech citizens Ivan Pilip and Jan Bubenik, now under arrest in Cuba, when they carried out their subversive and illegal mission.

"We do not wish to expatiate any further on this issue and we do apologize for speaking at such great length; however, we felt strongly about the need to explain our position once again before this distinguished Committee.

"We have considerable evidence attesting to the hostile, subversive and politically-motivated action of Freedom House against Cuba, action which clearly violates the rules and regulations that are supposed to govern the behaviour of non-governmental organizations in consultative status with the Economic and Social Council.

"Behaviour such as that of Freedom House tarnishes the stellar work being done throughout the world by the community of non-governmental organizations, whose contributions to the work of the United Nations deserve our unanimous praise, respect and support.

"In view of the foregoing, my delegation would like to request a special detailed report on the activities of Freedom House with respect to Cuba, including what my delegation noted in regard to that organization's work designed to identify, recruit, train and send persons to Cuba to carry out subversive activities to destabilize our country.

"My delegation will continue to monitor and document the interference of this alleged non-governmental organization in Cuba's internal affairs and its politically-motivated and hostile activities against Cuba, and will make such proposals as it deems appropriate to the Committee."

86. The delegation of the Sudan brought to the attention of the Committee information pertaining to certain activities of Freedom House. The delegation of the Sudan indicated that the organization had implicated itself in a highly politicized matter contrary to the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31, and had led a politically motivated campaign against her Government when it organized a "briefing on Sudan" on 5 October 2000 "to generate momentum toward denying Sudan a Security Council seat". She requested a written explanation from the organization on the briefing. She added that a strong message should be forwarded to non-governmental organizations, reaffirming the support of the Committee for non-governmental organizations in the important work they do and stressing the importance of the organizations abiding by United Nations rules and regulations.

87. The delegate of the United States of America emphasized that Freedom House was completely independent from the United States Government. In fact, the organization had in the past criticized the United States Government on several occasions, which demonstrated its independence from the Government.

He also underlined that the letter from the secretariat of the Human Rights Commission regarding the incident involving the organization, which was before the Committee, indicated that there had been no evidence of ill-intent on the part of the organization.

88. The Ambassador of Cuba made the following statement:

> "What my delegation said in its previous statement was neither hasty nor emotional. It contained in fact substantive and well-grounded criticisms which we have already raised before.
>
> "Freedom House has a long history of aggression towards our country and interference in its internal affairs. Moreover, its activities are largely funded by the United States Government.
>
> "To cite but one example, in the replies given by the organization itself to the Committee's question concerning its resources, we were surprised to note that, in 1999, Freedom House received $5,510,158 from USAID. We also noted that it received $120,000 from the National Endowment for Democracy, which is funded by the Government and Congress of the United States.
>
> "Therefore, we are of the view that this organization is not independent and that its activity is politically motivated. For those reasons, Freedom House does not meet the requirements laid down by Council resolution 1996/31 for granting non-governmental organizations consultative status with the Economic and Social Council."

89. The Committee decided to defer consideration of the status of Freedom House, pending receipt of a special report on the role and activities undertaken by the organization in Cuba and clarification to questions posed by Committee members.

Christian Solidarity International

90. At the first part of its 2000 session, the Committee had had before it a letter from the Permanent Representative of the Sudan to the President of the Council, regarding the circulation of publications to Member States at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights by Christian Solidarity International (CSI), an organization whose consultative status with the Council had been withdrawn by the Council pursuant to its decision 1999/292. The representative of the Sudan had requested that an investigation be conducted to find out how the organization was allowed to distribute its publications inside and outside the Commission meeting room and to take necessary action in order to put an end to that pattern of behaviour displayed by the organization.

91. The secretariat of the Commission had responded to the President of the Council, stating that it had taken immediate action following the complaint by the Sudan. Instructions had been given for any material carrying the letterhead of CSI to be removed from the pigeon holes reserved for delegations, as well as from the tables adjacent to the conference room of the Commission. However, the Secretariat had no way of investigating whether the distribution of CSI materials was carried out by another NGO or by an invited guest during parallel meetings. Similar measures would be adopted in 2001, and non-governmental organizations would be clearly informed prior to the fifty-sixth session of the Commission of the established rules and procedures. Emphasis would also be placed on the secretariat's responsibility to report any activities that violated those rules.

92. The Committee asked the Chairman to send a letter to the Commission, stating that the incident had been examined in depth by the Committee and reminding them of the contents of Council resolution 1996/31. The Chairman would also ask the secretariat of the Commission to take precautionary measures to ensure that such incidents did not recur at forthcoming sessions of the Commission. At its 784th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee had before it the letter from the secretariat of the Commission, assuring the Committee that the necessary precautionary measures taken and no efforts spared to ensure that such incidents did not recur in forthcoming sessions of the Commission. The delegation of the Sudan noted the assurances given by the Commission secretariat and was satisfied with its response. However, it reserved the right to raise the issue again if such an incident recurred at forthcoming sessions of the Commission, and reiterated the necessity that the secretariat of the Commission be vigilant in this respect and see to it that non-governmental organizations abided by the rules governing their participation in the Commission. The Committee decided to close the case (see chap. I, draft decision I).

World Confederation of Labour

93. At the same meeting, the Committee had before it a letter from the Permanent Representative of Mauritius to the Chair of the Commission on Human Rights regarding the circulation of documentation by a representative of the World Confederation of Labour at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission in Geneva. The Committee had also before it a response from the organization on the complaint. The representative of Mauritius asked the Committee to be given more time to review the response provided by the organization and to defer consideration of the issue to the next session of the Committee. The Committee deferred consideration of the matter to its next session.

International Confederation of Human Rights

94. At its 785th meeting, on 25 January, the Committee had before it a complaint by the Government of Bahrain against the International Federation of Human Rights regarding the conduct of a representative of the organization who circulated materials detrimental to the Government of Bahrain, at the fifty-sixth session of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

95. The Ambassador of Bahrain made the following statement:

Mr. Chairman,

"Allow me at the outset to express my sincere thanks to you for giving me an opportunity to make a statement under agenda item 7 entitled 'Consideration of special reports' and to commend you for your able management of the Committee's work. The delegation of the State of Bahrain wishes the members of the Bureau and the Committee every success.

"With regard to the Committee's consideration of agenda item 7, the Committee will find before it a complaint which the Government of Bahrain submitted on 19 April 2000 via its Permanent Mission to the United Nations concerning the conduct of a Mr. Abdul Nabi Hassan Mansur, who is registered under the auspices of the International Confederation of Human Rights. In Spring 2000, at the substantive session of the Commission on Human Rights, Mr. Mansur circulated materials detrimental to the Government of Bahrain, in violation of the rules and regulations established by the Economic and Social Council for the enjoyment of consultative status by non-governmental organizations. At the same session, the individual in question also spoke in a manner that was insulting to the members of Bahrain's official delegation and entirely inconsistent with the precepts and practices followed at United Nations meetings.

"The State of Bahrain calls upon the Committee to take action to prevent this type of person from engaging in such behaviour, and hopes that the incident will not be repeated in the future.

"Through you, Mr. Chairman, Bahrain also calls upon the International Confederation of Human Rights not to allow these people to work under its auspices without first verifying the legitimacy of their activities, and this with a view to ensuring that States Members of the United Nations are not offended by behaviour which breaches the protocols on meetings of the United Nations.

"The State of Bahrain hopes that the relevant organizations will take account of the positive steps which it has taken and is taking in the area of human rights and the promotion of the democratic process in Bahrain. It also welcomes the communications and requests for clarification which it has received in these domains and hopes that they will not be used to allow persons like Mr. Mansur and his cohorts, who represent no one but themselves, to sully the reputation of States Members of the United Nations and the organizations through which they operate.

"Lastly, we should like our statement to be recorded in the summary record of the Committee's proceedings."

96. The Ambassador of Bahrain asked the Secretariat to "appeal" to the organization not to repeat such incidents for the sake of all non-governmental organizations working with the United Nations. A delegation underlined that there was a pattern of violations by the organization which should be pointed out to the organization.

97. The Chair of the Committee, Levent Bilman (Turkey), emphasized that the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights in Geneva should be

informed once again that necessary precautions should be taken to avoid such incidents recurring during future sessions of the Commission.

98. The Committee decided to close the case (see chap. I, draft decision I).

VI. Review of the methods of work of the Committee: implementation of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31, including the process of accreditation of representatives of non-governmental organizations, and Council decision 1995/304

99. The Committee considered item 4 at its 781st to 783rd meetings, on 23 to 25 January 2001.

A. Working group established to review some aspects of the work of the Committee

100. At its 2000 session, the Committee agreed to establish a working group, which would meet informally to review some aspects of the methods of work of the Committee and report back to the Committee on the progress of its work during its resumed 2000 session.

101. The working group met on 26 September, 20 November and 8 December 2000, and focused on accreditation procedures, coordination with the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights, NGO training to be enhanced, security issues, the volume of applications received by the Secretariat and NGO invitations to Committee meetings.

102. The issues on the agenda of the working group were the following: volume of applications; accreditation procedure; coordination with the secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights; NGO training to be enhanced; security issues; reports of abuses of consultative status received by the Secretariat; procedure to follow for "written reasons" given to NGOs in case of sanctions; support for national NGOs; review of NGOs in status with the funds, programmes and specialized agencies; national clearance from NGOs registered in one country while operating from another region; deferment of applications; drafting of a new application questionnaire; drafting of new guidelines for quadrennial reports; NGO invitations to attend Committee meetings; use of new technology to facilitate the Committee and the circulation of information; closing inactive NGO files; and rules for resuming consultative status with the Council for suspended NGOs.

103. At its 784th meeting, on 24 January 2001, the Committee heard a statement by the representative of the NGO Section, in which the Committee was informed on the progress of work of the working group on the following issues:

Accreditation procedures

104. Benefiting from the presence in the meeting of the NGO focal point in the Director's Office in Geneva, the working group was informed that accreditation procedures were identical in Geneva and in New York.

105. As far as the accreditation to the Commission on Human Rights was concerned, the secretariat of the Commission was putting in place a database, accessible to delegations, which would provide an accurate number of NGOs and representatives registered for the Commission as well as the factual number of NGO participants in the Commission at the end of meetings. It was suggested that a list of NGO representatives attending Commission meetings, be supplied daily to delegations until the secretariat finalizes its new database.

Coordination with the secretariat of Human Rights Commission

106. A number of members of the working group stressed the importance of observing United Nations procedures with strict conformity on all United Nations premises. The secretariat of the Commission on Human Rights should ensure that those rules were observed. It was important to inform the participants of the contents of Council resolution 1996/31 and inform NGOs that they were responsible for the actions undertaken by the representatives they accredited. NGOs should receive a list of NGOs whose status has been suspended or withdrawn. NGO documentation should not be distributed or displayed in the conference room of the

Commission but displayed outside or, more appropriately, in the designated parallel meeting room assigned to NGOs by the secretariat. Additional mechanisms should be put in place by the Commission secretariat, in cooperation with the NGO liaison office in the Director's office and security services, in order to ensure proper progress of the meetings, order and respect of United Nations procedures inside the conference room.

Need to enhance NGO training

107. Emphasis was placed on the need to schedule informal NGO training sessions before and during meetings of the Commission on Human Rights in French, English and Spanish. However, due to financial constraints, the Geneva secretariat could only provide the service in French and English. It was suggested that a more comprehensive information letter on meeting procedures could be sent with the accreditation letter to the NGO representatives attending meetings.

Security issues

108. Though it was recognized that there are geographical and logistical differences between United Nations premises in New York and Geneva, members of the Committee emphasized that the proper adjustments should be made in order to have the overall United Nations security and safety rules and regulations observed in strict conformity on all United Nations premises. Additional mechanisms should be identified to improve Geneva security procedures.

Volume of applications

109. The Committee, having been informed by its secretariat that some 800 requests for application for consultative status were listed for 2001, requested to be provided with statistics on the number of letters of intent received, followed by a correspondence with the secretariat.

110. In order to facilitate the methods of work of the Committee, a number of delegations supported the idea of approving in the plenary meeting of the Committee the NGOs placed on list I in a package, on a no-objection basis. Several delegations expressed reservations about that proposal.

NGO invitations to Committee meetings

111. It was agreed that a different invitation letter should be sent to organizations submitting new applications and those whose deferred applications were being considered. Organizations submitting new applications should be simply informed of the dates of the meeting, and that their application might be reviewed at the meeting. Organizations whose applications had been deferred would receive a letter mentioning that the presence of a representative could be helpful if questions were posed by the Committee. A delegation expressed the view that the Committee could have two days of hearings for NGOs placed on list 2, so that those NGO representatives would not have to prolong their stay at the Headquarters.

New application questionnaire

112. A draft on a new application questionnaire will be circulated to the other members of the group. The draft was to be discussed at the next meeting of the working group, which was scheduled to be held after the resumed 2000 session of the Committee.

113. Having noted the progress made by the working group, the Committee agreed that it should continue to meet on a regular basis and should hold one meeting before the next session of the Commission on Human Rights, in 2001.

114. Having noted the lack of information of several organizations applying for consultative status with Council regarding the principles of Council resolution 1996/31, the Chairman of the Committee underlined the need for the NGO Section to continue and reinforce the training and information workshops that the Section makes available to non-governmental organizations in order for NGOs to be better acquainted with the United Nations system and its organs, and more specifically to become more familiar with the Council and the role that non-governmental organizations can play in its work.

B. Consideration of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Economic and Social Council resolution 1996/31

115. The Committee considered sub-item 4 (b) at its 781st and 782nd meetings, on 23 and 24 January 2001; it had before it E/C.2/1999/CRP.5.

116. At its 1999 session, the Committee had considered the issue of NGOs whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with Council resolution 1996/31, namely commercial/industrial, professional, religious, research/educational or government-funded organizations. Several members of the Committee had suggested that a precedent had already been set by granting status to those types of organization in the past. In addition, one member of the Committee had suggested that the granting of consultative status to industry or commercial-based NGOs might cause a further imbalance between the number of NGOs granted consultative status from the North and those granted consultative status from the South since industry/commercial NGOs were not only well financed but based primarily in the North. A debate had ensued on the definition of NGOs within the parameters of Council resolution 1996/31, with some members of the Committee suggesting that any organization without government ties could be considered a non-governmental organization. Others had objected to that broad definition. It had been agreed that the topic should be reconsidered in future consultations.

117. At its 781st meeting, on 23 January, the Chairman of the Committee suggested that the Committee take action on the applications that have been placed in that category for a considerable time. He referred to parts I, III and VIII of the arrangements for consultations with non-governmental organizations, as contained in Council resolution 1996/31, in which it was stipulated that the organization should be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Council and its subsidiary bodies, that it should undertake to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities, in accordance with its own aims and purposes and the nature and scope of its competence and activities, and that organizations should be admitted provided that they can demonstrate that their programme of work is of direct relevance to the aims and purposes of the United Nations. He expressed the view that the above-mentioned criteria could assist Committee members in their decisions and should constitute the basis for their reflection.

118. The Committee considered the applications of the following organizations that had been placed in that category.

International Group of P&I Clubs

119. At its 1998 and 1999 sessions, the Committee had deferred its decision on the application of the International Group of P&I Clubs due to the industrial and commercial nature of the organization. At its 781st meeting, on 23 January, the Committee reviewed the application. A number of delegations expressed the view that the organization was carrying out very useful activities. Others felt that because the specific field of expertise of the organization was not related to issues considered by the Council it could not contribute to its work. The Committee decided to recommend that the organization not be granted consultative status (see chap. I, draft decision I).

Women's Exchange Programme

120. At its 1999 session, the Committee had deferred its decision on the Women's Exchange Programme, which had previously been deferred from the resumed 1998 session due to a question of government funding. The application had been deferred again at the 2000 session of the Committee, pending receipt of an updated financial statement from the organization that had been requested by the Committee. At its 781st meeting, on 23 January, the Committee considered the application and heard the Observer for the Netherlands referring to the various and positive activities of the organization. The Observer for the Netherlands also underlined the independence of the organization in its policy-making decisions. However, a number of delegations expressed their concern about a substantial part of the organization's income coming from the Government. At the same meeting, the Committee decided to remove the application from the "grey area" category and consider it as a deferred application, and asked the organization to submit a new application reflecting an update of its activities and a response from the organization to questions posed by the Committee.

International Federation of Inspection Agencies

121. The Committee had deferred its decision on the application of the International Federation of Inspection Agencies at its 1998 and 1999 sessions due to the professional characteristics presented by the organization. At its 781st meeting, on 23 January, the Committee resumed consideration of the application of the organization. A number of delegations expressed reservations about the contribution that the organization could make to the Council if it received consultative status. The Committee decided to remove the organization from the grey area and defer consideration of its application for further consideration.

German Advisory Council on Global Change

122. The Committee had deferred its decision on the application of the General Advisory Council on Global Change at its 1998 and 1999 sessions on the basis of questions raised regarding its extensive funding. At its 782nd meeting, on 24 January, the representative of Germany took the floor to explain that, in his country, the Government could fund a non-governmental organization and ask for its expertise. He expressed the view that the organization is a commendable one that is independent in its decision-making and could contribute to the work of the Council in a supplementary way. However, a number of delegations were critical of the extensive funding received by the organization from the Government. They also had reservations about the organization's structure and its possible contribution to the Council. The Committee decided to keep the organization in the grey area and defer the decision on its application, pending receipt of clarification from the organization of questions posed by the Committee.

123. Owing to time constraints, the Committee did not consider the following organizations:

Confederation of German Forests Owners Associations

International Association of Conference Translators

Syrian Orthodox Church in America

Southern States Police Benevolent Association

Working Party "Brussels 1952"

124. The Committee agreed to add to the agenda of its working group the issue of organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31.

VII. Organization of the work of the session

A. Opening and duration of the session

125. The Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations held its resumed 2000 session from 15 to 26 January 2001. The Committee held 20 meetings (768th to 787th meetings).

B. Attendance

126. Representatives of all the States members of the Committee attended the session: Algeria, Bolivia, Chile, China, Colombia, Cuba, Ethiopia, France, Germany, India, Lebanon, Pakistan, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sudan, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America.

127. The following States Members of the United Nations were represented by observers: Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Indonesia, Ireland, Islamic Republic of Iran, Israel, Italy, Japan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Morocco, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia.

128. The Holy See, a non-member State, was also represented by an observer.

129. The Organization of the Islamic Conference, an intergovernmental organization, was represented.

130. The following specialized agencies were represented: United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, World Health Organization, United Nations Industrial Development Organization.

C. Agenda

131. At its 768th meeting, on 15 January, the Committee approved the organization of work for the resumed session in an informal paper.

D. Documentation

132. The list of documents before the Committee at its resumed 2000 session is contained in the annex.

VIII. Adoption of the report of the Committee on its resumed 2000 session

133. At its 787th meeting, on 26 January 2001, the Committee adopted the draft report contained in document E/C.2/2000/L.3, as well as in an informal paper, and authorized the Rapporteur to finalize the report in consultation with the members of the Committee and its secretariat.

Annex

List of documents before the Committee at its resumed 2000 session

Document number	*Agenda item*	*Title or description*
E/C.2/2000/1	2	Annotated provisional agenda
E/C.2/2000/2 and Add.1	4	Note by the Secretary-General containing quadrennial reports, 1994-1997 and 1995-1998, submitted through the Secretary-General pursuant to Council resolution 1996/31
E/C.2/2000/3	7	Note by the Secretary-General containing the special reports of the United Towns Agency for North-South Cooperation and the World Confederation of Labour
E/C.2/2000/R.2/Add.10-16	3 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing new applications for consultative status
E/C.2/2000/R.3 and Add.1 and 2	3 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing requests for reclassification
E/C.2/2000/CRP.1/Rev.1	3 (a)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications deferred from previous sessions of the Committee held in 1998-1999
E/C.2/2000/CRP.2	6	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing a compilation of deferred quadrennial reports
E/C.2/2000/CRP.3	3 (a)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing deferred requests for reclassification
E/C.2/2000/CRP.5	3 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications deferred from the first and second parts of the 2000 session of the Committee
E/C.2/2000/CRP.6	5	Note by the Secretary-General on the implementation of Economic and Social Council decision 1996/302

Document number	*Agenda item*	*Title or description*
E/C.2/2000/CRP.7		Memorandum by the Secretary-General containing applications from non-governmental organizations on the Roster for the purpose of the work of the Commission on Sustainable Development to expand their participation in other fields of the work of the Council (E/C.2/2000/CRP.7)
E/C.2/2000/L.3	9	Draft report
E/C.2/1999/CRP.5	4 (b)	Memorandum by the Secretary-General transmitting a compilation of non-governmental organizations whose defining characteristics are not in strict conformity with the provisions of Council resolution 1996/31